

THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

MARTIN REHAL,

Plaintiff,

v.

HAZLETON CITY POLICE, et al.,

Defendants.

3:22-CV-75
(JUDGE MARIANI)

FILED
SCRANTON

APR 01 2022

PER SP
DEPUTY CLERK

ORDER

AND NOW, THIS 15th DAY OF APRIL, 2022, upon review of Magistrate Judge

Martin Carlson's Report and Recommendation ("R&R") (Doc. 6) for clear error or manifest injustice,¹ **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:**

1. The R&R (Doc. 6) is **ADOPTED** for the reasons set forth therein.
2. Plaintiff's Complaint (Doc. 1) is **DISMISSED without leave to amend**.
3. The Clerk of Court is directed to **CLOSE** the above-captioned action.


Robert D. Mariani
United States District Judge

¹ Plaintiff mailed the Court an email that he sent to "martin792@verizon.net" on January 26, 2022 (see Doc. 7) wherein he states that he "would have to object based on the fact that the department of Justice is still investigating my allegations. . ." Plaintiff's email is insufficient to rise to the level of an Objection to the R&R. If a party timely and properly files a written objection to a Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation, the District Court "shall make a *de novo* determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C); see also, *Brown v. Astrue*, 649 F.3d 193, 195 (3d Cir. 2011); M.D. Pa. Local Rule 72.3. Here, while Plaintiff's email-letter was timely filed, he has only made a generalized objection to the entire R&R and has failed to identify any specific portions of the R&R or proposed findings to which he objects. The Court thus need not engage in a *de novo* analysis. Nonetheless, upon review of the relevant documents, even if this Court applied a *de novo* review, the result would be the same.